

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

AUBREY V. TAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

SARA BLOND (FBI), LOVISA DVORAK
(Kent P.D),

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-01717-JCC

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT
SARA BLOND'S MOTION TO SEAL
PLAINTIFF PRO SE's FILINGS
(PROPOSED COMPLAINTS –
AMENDMENT) and SUBSTITUTION OF
REDACTED VERSIONS**

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on the Defendant FBI Special Agent Sara Blond's Motion to Seal the Plaintiff Prisoner *Pro Se*, Mr. Taylor's various proposed *in forma pauperis* civil rights Complaints, and his related Motion to Supplement (Amended Complaint) for allegedly improperly identifying – disclosing the personal identification information (PII) of a minor female victim and other alleged adult female victims of the Plaintiff's previously convicted criminal conduct involving the *Human Trafficking* of females, for commercial sex (prostitution) purposes, which offenses were committed through Plaintiff's use of *force, fraud and coercion*. See e.g., *U.S. v. Aubrey V. Taylor*, 2:16-cr-00300-RS (Dist. Ct., WDWA) – Docket Sheet (*Taylor #1 – criminal case prosecution*); *U.S. v. Taylor*, 828 Fed.Appx. 491, 493 (9th Cir., Nov. 4, 2020) (direct appeal following conviction – first sentence; reversing order denying

1 motion to suppress and vacating convictions on Counts 1 and 2) (*Taylor #2*); and *U.S. v. Taylor*,
2 2024 WL 1108601 (9th Cir. March 14, 2024) (*Taylor #3*) (affirming resentence).

3 Having considered the motion and related records and materials filed or referenced herein
4 and Plaintiff's failure to respond to the motion, and the Court being fully advised, it hereby
5 RULES as follows:

6 Plaintiff is asserting a *pros se – in forma pauperis* civil rights lawsuit against SA Blond
7 and TFO Det. Dvorak, claiming that he is entitled to the recovery of damages and other remedies
8 for the law enforcement officials failure to *more timely* apply for and execute a search warrant on
9 one of his cell phones (Galaxy S-5), which Plaintiff used to facilitate his sex trafficking offenses
10 and which phone was lawfully seized from Plaintiff at the time of his lawful arrest. The arrest
11 and criminal investigative events that followed ultimately led to the Plaintiff Mr. Taylor being
12 charged with five (5) counts of *Human Trafficking* young females (including a minor) for
13 commercial sex (prostitution) purposes. *Id.* Plaintiff elected to challenge the government's
14 evidence and he was convicted by a jury on all counts in March 2019.

15 On direct appeal, the Ninth Circuit reversed the District Court's pretrial order denying
16 suppression of evidence obtained through the cell phone search warrant, which was sought –
17 secured 14 months after the cell phone's original lawful seizure. *Taylor #2, id.* The Ninth Circuit
18 also concluded that the now suppressed evidence of *human trafficking* derived from the untimely
19 cell phone search was the material substance of the government's evidence supporting Plaintiff's
20 convictions on Counts No. 1 and 2 of the Second Superseding Indictment (SSI), and therefore
21 the appeals court also vacated the jury's convictions on those two counts (which offense -
22 conduct involved the sex trafficking of the minor female victim "H.S.").

23 Plaintiff now asserts in his various civil suit filings here that he is entitled to seek and
24 secure *damages* and other relief from the law enforcement officers for their untimely search of
25

1 his seized cell phone in violation of the Fourth Amendment. *See* Dkt. Nos. 1-1, 4-2, 4-3, 6
 2 (Complaints – signature pages (proposed) and 15 (Motion to Supplement). However, Plaintiff’s
 3 proposed Complaint and his Motion to Supplement impermissibly reveals and discloses the full
 4 names or identity references of trafficked females and/or describes the *sex trafficked victims’*
 5 conduct. Thus, the Defendant S.A. Blond, through counsel, moves to seal Plaintiff’s offending
 6 filings that reveals and discloses sex trafficking victims’ and minor’s personal identity
 7 information (PII), as well as other sensitive sex trafficking information. *Id.* Defendant SA Blond
 8 seeks to have these offending filings sealed and replaced with proposed substituted, redacted
 9 versions of those pleadings. *See* Dkt. 20 - Defendant’s Motion to Seal – Substitute Redacted
 10 Pleadings, Exhibit 1001 – Redacted Complaint (to replace current Dkt. Nos. 1-1, 4-2, 4-3, 6);
 11 and Exhibit 1002 – Redacted Motion to Supplement (Dkt. 15).

12
 13 There exists a strong preference for public access to court records. *See Kamakana v. City*
 14 *and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). However, that presumption is not
 15 resolute and may be overcome upon a showing of a victim – minor – third parties’ right and need
 16 to protect their personal identifying information (PII), and/or the rights and protections provided
 17 to victims – witnesses, particularly those who have been trafficked for prostitution purposes. *See*
 18 authority to seal – redact provided by *Dietz v. Bouldin*, 579 U.S. 40, 45 (2016); *Kamakana v.*
 19 *City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); CVCWRA, 18 U.S.C. §
 20 3509(d); JFAA, 18 U.S.C. § 3771; *United States v. Doe*, 655 F.2d 920, 922 n.1 (9th Cir. 1981;
 21 *Daschke v. Hartenstein*, 2018 WL 3619956, at *2 (D. Ariz. 2018) (Directing Clerk to seal
 22 proposed First Amended Complaint, which referenced minors’ identifiers (i.e., first and full
 23 names), which “must either be excluded or partially redacted” from the filing); *United States v.*
 24 *Bibikov*, 2023 WL 6128190 (D. ID 2023) (sealing – redacting exhibits because the “dignity and
 25 privacy” of the victims outweighs the public’s interest in access).

Defendant SA Blond has shown that the female crime victims' and minor's rights and interests in maintaining their anonymity and in protecting their statutory right to dignity, respect and privacy, outweighs the public's interest in that information in this case, and, further, there is no material prejudice to the Plaintiff in redacting this information. Therefore, based on this Court's inherent authority, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2, et seq., the Child Victim's and Child Witnesses' Rights Act, as well as the Justice for All Act, the court concludes that Defendant SA Blond has sufficiently shown that the female crime victims' and the minor female's rights and interests in maintaining their third-party anonymity in this collateral civil lawsuit, and the statutory obligation of the Court to protect victims' – minor's identity, dignity and privacy, substantially outweighs the public's interest in this information.

1. THE CLERK OF THE COURT shall seal Plaintiff's filings at Dkt. Nos. 1-1, 4-2, 4-3, 6 (Complaints – signature pages (proposed) and 15 (Motion to Supplement); and,

2. The Clerk shall replace – substitute those filings with Defendant's proposed redacted versions of those sealed filings. *See e.g.*, Dkt. 20's attached Exhibit 1001 – Proposed Complaint (redacted) and replacing Dkt. Nos. 1-1, 402, 4.3, 6); and Exhibit 1002 s – Redacted Motion to Supplement (Amended Complaint), replacing Dkt. No. 15.

3. Plaintiff *Pro Se* is reminded that he must comply with both the Fed.R.Civ.P. and the Local Civil Rules (LCR), and other applicable laws applicable to his filings with this Court. This includes an obligation to protect and prevent the disclosure of the names - identities of sex trafficked victims – participants in all future filings. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 5.2 and LCR 5.2.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 27th day of June, 2024.



David W. Christel
United States Magistrate Judge